

MINISTRY OF  
TRANSPORT AND CIVIL AVIATION

PARKING SURVEY  
OF INNER LONDON

*FINAL REPORT*

November, 1957

LONDON: HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE  
1958



# Contents

## Part A : Introduction

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Pages</i>
Introduction . . . . .	1-2	1

## Part B : Signs

Introduction . . . . .	3-4	2
Signs at entries to and exits from "Controlled Zone" . . . . .	5-10	2
Illumination of Signs . . . . .	11	3
Loading and Unloading . . . . .	12-17	3
Mews . . . . .	18-20	3
Special provision at Embassies and Ministries . . . . .	21-22	3
Signs on Parking Meters . . . . .	23-24	4
General . . . . .	25	4

## Part C : Peripheral Parking

Introduction . . . . .	26-27	5
Peripheral Parking on Streets . . . . .	28-39	5-6
Peripheral Parking Off the Highway . . . . .	40-44	7
Reservation by Mr. F. J. Forty . . . . .		8
Appendix 1 . . . . .		9
Appendix 2 . . . . .		10
Appendix 3 . . . . .		11
Appendix 4 . . . . .		12
Appendix 5 . . . . .		13-14
Appendix 6 . . . . .		15

## A: Introduction

1. The Minister of Transport and Civil Aviation announced to Parliament on 21st March, 1956, that he had asked a small committee to undertake a completely new survey of the parking position in Inner London. The members of the Committee asked to undertake this survey were as follows:

Mr. A. SAMUELS, C.B.E., A.M.I.Mech.E., M.Inst.T. (*Chairman*),  
Chairman of the London and Home Counties Traffic Advisory Committee.

Mr. D. F. ALLEN,  
Assistant Secretary, Road Traffic Division, Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation.

Mr. J. CLAPP, B.Sc., A.M.I.C.E., M.I.Mun.E., A.M.T.P.I.,  
Borough Engineer and Surveyor, Camberwell Metropolitan Borough Council.

Mr. F. J. FORTY, O.B.E., B.Sc., M.Inst.C.E., F.R.Sa.L., M.I.Mun.E.,  
City Engineer, City of London.

Mr. A. W. HOOGE, B.Sc., A.M.I.C.E., M.I.Mun.E.,  
City Engineer and Surveyor, City of Westminster.

Mr. C. E. HOLLINGHURST, M.Eng., A.M.I.C.E.,  
Divisional Road Engineer for the Metropolitan Division, Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation.

Commander W. C. NORTHCOFF, R.N.R. (Ret.), R.D., D.L., J.P.,  
Treasurer of the Metropolitan Boroughs' Standing Joint Committee.

Mr. NORMAN PRICHARD, M.Sc., J.P.,  
Chairman of the Metropolitan Boroughs' Standing Joint Committee and Member of London County Council.

Mr. J. SIMPSON, O.B.E.,  
Assistant Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police in charge of Traffic.

Colonel A. E. YOUNG, C.M.G.,  
Commissioner of Police for the City of London.

*Secretaries:* Mr. P. E. LAZARUS.

Mr. J. A. L. BARRER (who succeeded Mr. Lazarus in August, 1957).

2. The Committee made an Interim Report in September, 1956, which set out its main recommendations for the control of parking in Inner London. The present final report is supplementary to the Interim Report and completes the task undertaken by the

Committee. It includes, in Parts B and C, the Committee's recommendations relating to the signs required for areas in which parking metres are introduced and to parking on the periphery of the Inner Area.

## B: Signs

### Introduction

3. In our Interim Report published on 12th December, 1956, we stated (paragraph 103) that we had not been able to recommend a scheme of signing, but that we would do so at an early date for one of the sample areas dealt with in that report. In view of the technical nature of the subject, we appointed a sub-committee to consider the matter in detail and in accordance with the more general views on the subject set out in paragraphs 99/103 of the Interim Report. In those paragraphs we stated that every effort should be made, at least to begin with, to keep the number of signs to a reasonable minimum. We also set out our view that there should be at every possible approach to the controlled parking zone a large and unmistakable sign to indicate that, within the zone, certain general rules would apply which would not, as with the present system, be individually indicated by traffic signs. Any exceptions to the general rules would, of course, require to be signed or otherwise indicated.

4. As set out in paragraph 101 of our Interim Report, there would be two general rules. In the first place no vehicle could, with certain limited exceptions, be parked on any street in the zone within the relevant hours except at a parking meter on payment of the relevant charge. Secondly, loading and unloading would be permitted anywhere in any street except where such operations were specifically prohibited or restricted, either at all times, or during specified times. Working on these general lines, we have now prepared detailed proposals for the north-west Mayfair sample area already described in the Interim Report.

### Signs at entries to and exits from "Controlled Zone"

5. We consider that motorists must have no excuse for pleading that at the time and place when an alleged offence was committed they were unaware that they were in a "controlled zone" to which the provisions of a Parking Place Order applied. It is therefore necessary that every possible vehicle entry to a "controlled zone" shall be provided with sufficient signs of such dimensions as to ensure that a motorist entering that zone cannot overlook them and that the legend on these signs shall leave him in no doubt as to their intention.

6. We consider that at every point at which a street first enters a "controlled zone" there should be erected on both sides of that street a sign bearing the following legend:

C  
ZONE  
ENTRY  
  
METER  
PARKING  
ONLY  
  
MONDAY-FRIDAY  
8.30 A.M.-6.30 P.M.

The sign would have a curved top into which the letter "C" would fit, thus giving it a shape quite different from that of any other traffic sign, and the

lettering would be black on a yellow background with a red border. The signs appropriate for most sites would be about 3 ft. high and 2 ft. wide but in special circumstances, e.g. in busy, wide roads, one about half as high and half as wide again could be used. It is hoped that, with this distinctive appearance and size, they would be immediately distinguishable by drivers entering the zone. The sign is illustrated at Appendix 1.

7. The sign would be so mounted that the height of its under-side above the footway was, wherever possible, 7 ft. 6 in. This system of signing requires that, within the zone, any exceptions to the general rule that all restrictions apply for the standard hours of 8.30 a.m. to 6.30 p.m., Monday to Friday, will require to be indicated by individual signs or markings. It will, however, be desirable to indicate the days and hours of operation of meters and other information on a plate attached to each meter or post, and we deal with this later.

8. We considered the use of other signs, but were satisfied that, for the purpose, the foregoing sign was most suitable. One alternative was a letter "M" (for meter) in place of the "C", but we thought that "C" was more directly related to the "controlled zone". We also considered the use of a sign reading:

ENTRY TO  
CONTROL  
ZONE  
  
METER  
PARKING  
ONLY  
  
MONDAY-FRIDAY  
8.30 A.M.-6.30 P.M.

We concluded that this sign would be less striking and distinctive and would not readily lend itself to anything other than the rectangular shape of other traffic signs. For comparison, this sign is illustrated at Appendix 2.

9. We also considered the use of a pictorial sign but rejected this as unsuitable.

10. It should be made equally clear to a motorist at what point he is leaving a "controlled zone", and we recommend that a sign should, wherever appropriate, be erected "back to back" with or near to the entry sign referred to above; these exit signs would bear the legend:

END  
OF  
ZONE

in black letters on a yellow background with black border, the overall size being approximately 20 inches by 20 inches or alternatively 30 inches by 30 inches where required, except where erected back to back with an entry sign when a larger sign could be used at the discretion of the local authority.

*Illumination of Signs*

11. Signs which are to be operative during any of the hours of darkness will have to be adequately illuminated. We do not consider that, in built-up areas, the use of reflecting surfaces would be suitable for this purpose. In view, however, of the experimental nature of the system we advocate, we do not think that the signs need always be illuminated with individual lamps, at least in the first place, provided they are sited so as to be clearly visible, and their message legible, by the light of the existing street lighting.

*Loading and Unloading*

12. We consider that some restrictions must be imposed on loading and unloading goods but that, for the present at any rate, no restrictions will be required on the picking up and setting down of passengers. Restrictions on loading and unloading fall into three separate categories, viz:

- (1) at certain intersections where loading and unloading must be banned throughout the day; (see paragraph 14 below)
- (2) in streets where loading and unloading could not be tolerated on both sides and some form of unilateral loading and unloading would be required;
- (3) in certain lengths of road where, during specified hours only, loading and unloading should be banned in the interests of moving traffic.

Where there is to be a complete prohibition on loading and unloading ((1) above) we feel that the erection of signs can be avoided by the use of distinctive markings on the surface of the highway. Several methods of displaying such markings have been considered and, as an experiment, we arranged to paint alternative types on the surface of a private street under the control of the Westminster City Council, where we had the opportunity of seeing them and assessing their relative merits.

13. In the event, we originally favoured a broken yellow line. We understand, however, that this marking is used elsewhere to convey a different message and we think that it would be inadvisable to introduce a marking which is open to different interpretations. At this stage therefore, we confine ourselves to suggesting the use of a yellow marking in the channel, the details of which will need to be approved by the Minister.

14. Such markings would certainly have to be put down at some road junctions where within pre-determined limits the stopping of vehicles for the purposes of loading and unloading could not be tolerated on account of the obstruction caused to the free movement of traffic at the junction. It is not suggested, however, that they would be required at every junction, as at most minor ones the occasional impediment to traffic flow would have no serious consequences and could be tolerated. Every junction, consequently, would have to be considered on its merits, and the limits within which the prohibition was to operate would vary according to the circumstances of each case.

15. We think that this method of indicating complete prohibitions is to be preferred to that of erecting more signs on the public highway. In the first instance, the markings could be made in paint, and if they proved effective (and when all concerned are satisfied that the

limits have been properly determined) could be replaced by a more permanent material, such as insect coloured mastic asphalt.

16. There would, however, be some cases within a "controlled zone" where an absolute prohibition on stopping was unnecessary but where, nevertheless, stopping would have to be restricted in some way or another (as in (2) of paragraph 12 above), or where it was desirable to prohibit loading and unloading between specified hours (as in (3) of paragraph 12 above). In these cases the erection of appropriate signs appears to be inevitable.

17. The implementation in the north-west area of Mayfair (which we have already recommended should be the first "controlled zone") of the signing proposals outlined above would require the erection of 32 "entry" signs and 30 "exit" signs. Altogether some 70 signs would be required in the zone, considerably less than the number used in the area at present.

*Mews*

18. In our Interim Report we stated (paragraphs 42/43) that certain mews presented particular difficulties to a comprehensive scheme. We concluded that the least unsatisfactory solution would be to exclude such mews from the zone.

19. We consider that the following sign might be used at each entrance to any mews, courtyard, etc. to be excluded from the Zone:

**THIS MEWS  
NOT PART OF  
CONTROL ZONE**

This sign would be approximately 2 ft. by 1 ft. with 2 inch lettering black on a white background, with the word "MEWS" amended as appropriate.

20. We do not think that, to begin with at any rate, any sign will be required to warn drivers leaving such a mews that they are re-entering the controlled zone. We recommend, however, that this aspect of the subject should be kept under study and should be subject to review in the light of experience.

*Special provision at Embassies and Ministries*

21. We consider that it will be desirable to reserve kerb space outside Embassies, Legations and Ministries for the use of the occupants, whether for parking or for loading or unloading; this space should normally not provide for more than two or three cars but the actual number will have to be decided in each case. In the first instance we think that no special signs will be required but in the light of experience it may prove necessary to erect signs. Such signs might read "Embassy Parking Only". In every such case the office concerned will have a porter or commissionaire whose task it should be to supervise the use of this space. We recognise that the category of special offices for which reserved parking of this kind should be provided must be kept to a minimum, and an arbitrary line must be drawn. We think that in the case of Embassies and Legations the concession should be made as a matter of diplomatic privilege and that in the case of Ministries it should be a matter of respect for Ministers.

22. We also consider that, in some cases at any rate, special provision may be required at the residences of Ambassadors and, where this is so, we think that similar arrangements may be required.

*Signs on Parking Meters*

23. Although the signs at each entry to a controlled zone will indicate the days and hours of operation of parking meters, we consider that it will be desirable to repeat this information on each parking meter so that the motorist will be in no doubt as to when he is required to park only at meters and that he has to pay for the parking facility. We also consider that the motorist should be informed of the time (or times) for which he may park, the appropriate charge (or charges), the excess period for which he may stay without committing an offence and the amount of the charge for which he will be liable if he stays for any part of that period. This information should be clearly displayed on a plate or other device fixed to the meter, which might then read as follows:

MONDAY-FRIDAY  
8.30 A.M. TO 6.30 P.M.

---

METER CHARGES  
EITHER 6D. FOR 1 HOUR OR  
1/- FOR 2 HOURS ONLY

(Maximum time allowed by meter payment)

---

PARKING IN EXCESS OF  
TIME PAID FOR IN METER  
INCURS EXCESS CHARGE 10/-  
PAYABLE TO CITY TREASURER

---

AFTER 2 HOURS EXCESS PARKING  
PENALTY

---

24. We have given a great deal of attention to the precise form which this message should take. All the shorter or simpler versions we have considered contain some inadequacy or ambiguity which could provide excuses for misunderstanding. While regretting the length of the message, on balance something of this kind would appear to be inevitable, in view of the

nature of the system to be introduced. It is, therefore, most important that the full message should be presented in a prominent position on the meter itself so that every motorist can see it clearly. We understand, however, that the design of some makes of meter makes it difficult or impossible to display the message we recommend. The siting and spacing of the message will, therefore, have to be adjusted to suit the requirements of individual meters, or a separate plate might be needed on the post. In our view it is most desirable that the full purport of the message should be given, even if it has to be divided and displayed in two parts. It would, of course, have to be appropriately amended to meet the circumstances of particular cases, and some shortening might be possible if the parking place order provided for a single meter period only.

*General*

25. In our *Interim Report* we stated (paragraph 53) that we considered that the only practicable approach to the introduction of parking meters would be to start in one place within the Inner Area and we recommended that this place should be the north-west area of Mayfair. We further recommended that this area should be extended as and when practicable. We did not favour the authorisation of separate zones within the Inner Area, which we thought would be confusing to motorists. Our foregoing proposals on signs are based on the acceptance of our recommendation for the creation of one zone which can expand as required. We are doubtful whether this system could be applied if a number of separate zones were appointed within the Inner Area. We appreciate that our system may tax the memory of drivers as the zone expands and motorists find themselves required to keep general prohibitions on parking in mind in a great many streets in the zone where there are no special signs. One of our initial purposes has been to see how far a system could be devised which was both workable and avoided the multiplicity of signs inherent in other methods, but it will be necessary to watch drivers' actual behaviour, as the zone expands, and to judge the effectiveness of the signing system we propose in the light of drivers' actual behaviour. What we have proposed might, we hope, prove successful wherever there are small schemes of parking control, even if in some other cases experience were to prove a system involving more signs to be necessary.

## C: Peripheral Parking

### Introduction

26. When we received our terms of reference to carry out a parking survey, the Minister suggested to the Chairman, as set out in paragraph 6 of our Interim Report, that at a later stage the Committee might be able to indicate areas round the periphery of the Inner Area, as defined, where motorists might be authorised to park if they could not find accommodation within it.

27. In paragraph 68 of our Interim Report we said that we had not been able to consider where all-day parking might be permitted in the streets in such fringe areas as Bayswater, Kensington, Camden Town or Kennington, which were used during the railway strike of 1955. We pointed out that once a scheme of controlled parking had been introduced in the Inner Area, the long term parker who continued to drive to work and who could not or would not use off-street parking places would have no alternative but to use these areas. We also pointed out that the areas in question were not always convenient for obtaining public transport to the Inner Area, particularly at rush hours, and that residents who were prepared to accept organised parking in residential streets in the conditions of an emergency might not take a similar view in ordinary circumstances. We thought, however, that a scheme of fringe parking would make a useful contribution, even as a temporary measure, to alleviate conditions in Inner London, and we stated our intention of exploring the subject further.

### Peripheral Parking on Streets

28. In our consideration of this subject we were immediately confronted with several difficulties. In the first place, the Minister's request for peripheral parking places related to a scheme of controlled parking for the whole Inner Area whereas it appeared to us that some time must elapse before the whole of the Inner Area would be subject to control and that, until such time, suggestions for parking outside that area would have little practical value. Motorists would continue to park for long periods in the streets as near to the controlled zone as they could and would ignore parking areas provided further away from the zone until they were compelled, by the expansion of the zone, to use them. We therefore decided to relate our proposals to the West End as being the area to be first affected by parking meters and having the severest parking problem. In the second place, we had no information as to the origins of the large number of motorists daily driving into London and parking their vehicles on the streets. It seemed to us that the siting of long term parking places, whether on or off the street, must have some relation not only to the routes normally used by the motorists but also to the public transport facilities available to enable them to complete their journeys. We attached a great deal of importance to both these factors. We were reminded of the experience with a large car park opened near Lambeth underground station in December, 1955. This free car park, having accommodation for some 600 cars was opened as a temporary measure for the heavy Christmas traffic at the Geraldine Mary Harmsworth Park only fifteen minutes bus ride from the West End. Despite the customary large increase of traffic at that season, the car park never held more than 45 cars at any one time. Some complaints were, however, made

about the difficulty of boarding public transport during the rush hour. We think, therefore, that not only must parking places be carefully sited in relation to the main flows of traffic which would use them but also to the transport available to enable motorists to proceed to their destinations.

29. Even if we had had the time and the resources to do so, the introduction of fuel rationing made it impossible for us to undertake any researches into the origins of vehicular traffic entering London and we were compelled to ascertain whether any information on the subject was already available. We obtained information from three sources:

- (1) The Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis;
- (2) The Commissioner of Police for the City of London; and
- (3) The Road Research Laboratory.

30. The Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis furnished information about the districts from which drivers came who during a short sample period of the summer of 1956 were reported for obstruction, writing longer than permitted and similar offences in the area bounded by Oxford Street, Park Lane, Piccadilly, St. James's Street, Pall Mall and Charing Cross Road, which therefore includes the whole Mayfair area.

31. The distribution of the districts of origin of the 1,042 persons concerned was as follows:

		North of Thames	South of Thames	Total	Percentage
<i>Radius from Charing Cross</i>					
0-2½ mile	..	225	6	231	22%
2½-5 mile	..	217	31	248	26%
5-7½ mile	..	100	49	149	14%
7½-10 mile	..	72	31	103	10%
Total	..	694	117	751	72%
<i>Outside 10-mile radius of Charing Cross but within the London Traffic Area (i.e. a band some 15 miles wide)</i>					
		94	81	175	17%

This leaves 116 (11%) whose addresses were outside the London Traffic Area.

Some 60% of all these drivers lived north of the River Thames, west of a line drawn from north to south through Charing Cross and within a radius of 10 miles from Charing Cross.

32. The Commissioner of Police for the City of London reported that, during 1956, 1,673 drivers were prosecuted in the City for unnecessary obstruction and an investigation of their addresses showed that their distribution was as follows:

		<i>Radius from the Bank of England crossing</i>	
0-3 mile	..	..	175 = 12%
3-5 mile	..	..	336 = 23%
5-7 mile	..	..	336 = 23%
7-10 mile	..	..	342 = 23%
Total	..	..	1,189 = 81%
<i>More than 10 mile radius from the Bank of England crossing</i>			286 = 19%

About 60% of all the addresses were located north of the River Thames and in three well defined areas viz:

- (a) St. John's Wood, Hampstead and Golders Green;
- (b) Hornsey, Wood Green, Friern Barnet and Southgate;
- (c) Hackney, Ilford, Watford and Chingford.

33. The Road Research Laboratory had carried out a parking generation survey in terms of the direction and distance of the origin (home address) of the individuals who made the whole journey by car and some of the information they obtained was made available to us. They had carried out interviews at nine offices, six factories and eight shops, the majority of which were in the area of Mayfair, Tottenham Court Road and Holborn. The difference between the distribution and distance for the staffs, visitors and shoppers were not large and the following table is a summary of the results:

Radius from Aldwych					
0-2½ mile	..	..	..	..	20%
2½-5 mile	..	..	..	..	13%
5-7½ mile	..	..	..	..	13%
7½-10 mile	..	..	..	..	16%
Total	..	..	..	..	62%
10-15 mile	..	..	..	..	16%
Outside 15 mile	..	..	..	..	22%

34. The results of these very limited but quite independent checks are remarkably consistent and indicate that most of the parkers in central London originate within 10 miles of the centre and that, so far as the information provided by both Police forces is concerned, the majority of parkers originate in the north-west of London and within 7½ miles of the centre.

35. When fuel rationing was first introduced it was thought that motorists, particularly from the outer suburbs and neighbouring home counties, would conserve their supplies by motoring to a convenient railway station, park their cars there and continue their journeys by public transport. To meet this additional demand for parking space the Minister wrote to local authorities asking for their co-operation in earmarking temporary additional parking accommodation in streets adjacent to stations. After rationing had been in force for some time, the Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis called for returns from eleven outer police Divisions showing what facilities were available at both London Transport and British Railways stations, how they were being used and whether any additional street parking was taking place. The Divisions concerned can be taken as embracing a belt about 8 miles wide round the outer part of the Metropolitan Police District and stretching from Ealing to Uxbridge, Barnes to Staines and Cobham, Tooting to Kingswood and Banstead, Dulwich to Croydon, New Cross to Beckley, East Ham to Dagenham, Walthamstow to Chigwell, Tottenham to Enfield, Finchley to Potters Bar and Harlesden to Northwood. This belt contains almost all the terminal stations of the London Transport Executive and many of the British Railways stations which would be considered as focal points for travellers coming into the Metropolitan Police District. The results are summarised at Appendices 3 and 4. They show that, even at a time when increased user might have been expected, the available accommodation was only used to about 60% of its capacity.

36. We were informed that the Minister and the Chairman of the British Transport Commission had been in correspondence about the need to provide parking facilities for motorists during the period of fuel rationing. The Chairman of the Commission had pointed out that they had already provided parking accommodation at more than three hundred London suburban stations on British Railways, at forty-one London Transport stations and were proposing to provide additional facilities at a number of other stations. The Chairman also stated that the Commission had not received a single complaint about the lack of parking facilities.

37. In view of the fact that the majority of motorists entering the zone were coming from distances of less than 10 miles, that the station car parks in the outer zone of the Metropolitan Police District were by no means being fully utilized and that the Commission were aware of no parking difficulties, we concluded that there was no need for us to make any recommendations for parking at the outer approaches to London. Moreover, because a great many motorists originated from less than 7½ miles from the centre, we considered that there would be little use in our recommending sites which were some 4 or 5 miles out as, in our opinion, motorists would not be prepared to drive for only two or three miles and then change to public transport. We therefore concluded that we should limit our detailed recommendations to those streets which would serve the north-west quadrant and be reasonably near to the West End, but that we should also give some examples of the type of street which we think would be suitable on the south side of the River Thames. We appreciate that there may be exceptions to this general rule but we do not think that, at this stage, we need try to cater for them. It occurs to us, for example, that additional parking facilities might be provided at suitable places to serve such roads as Western Avenue and the Great West Road. These roads are intended for the movement of large volumes of traffic and if, for example, accommodation were provided in the Hammersmith area, incoming motorists using the Great West Road would be enabled to park their cars and continue their journeys on the wide range of public transport services available there.

38. The streets to be used as parking places would have to be conveniently close to public transport services as motorists would not be prepared to park their cars in areas involving a long walk to bus or tube services, they would have to be suitable for parking from a traffic point of view and parking would have to be free of charge. Bearing all these factors in mind, we have compiled a list of suitable streets to serve the north-west quadrant, which is reproduced at Appendix 5 and a much shorter list of specimen streets on the south of the river, which is at Appendix 6. They will have to be designated as authorised parking places to ensure that motorists would be afforded some protection against complaints of obstruction and they would have to be signposted to indicate their purpose and to encourage motorists to use them. Those nearest to the "controlled parking zone" will soon be absorbed into the zone as it expands and streets further out will have to be found to take their place. This should not be difficult in the light of the experience gained from the use of the streets we now recommend.

39. We should like to make it clear that, in compiling this list we have not consulted the local authorities in whose areas they are, nor have we taken

into consideration the reaction of frontagers many of whom are accustomed to parking their own cars in the street for relatively long periods. We assume, however, that if parking at meters is to be authorised in central London, people living on the fringe of that area cannot hope to avoid the consequences. Nevertheless, we think that certain difficulties may arise and we hope, therefore, that the use of the highway for authorised long term parking will be a temporary measure and that off-street parking accommodation will in due course be provided to deal with these vehicles.

#### *Peripheral Parking Off the Highway*

40. We recognise that for the time being most of the vehicles displaced from the West End, if brought to central London at all, will have to be parked on the streets. We are, however, convinced that that is not a durable state of affairs and that eventually accommodation off the streets must be found. It is no part of our present duty to go over old ground in regard to the provision of multi-storey or underground garages; we are glad to note the first signs of a break in this intractable subject, notably in the City of London, Westminster, St. Marylebone and Finsbury where positive plans for off-street parking are developing. We understand that in their review of the Development Plan the London County Council is investigating with the local authorities concerned the possibility of designating sites for the provision of off-street car parks and garages. We have, however, made efforts to explore other lines of approach on which we feel that there is a possibility of interim progress short of the full parking programme for London which we are convinced must one day come.

41. For parking accommodation of the kind we have in mind to be successful the same criteria must apply as for long-term street parking places, namely, proximity to main routes to the West End and to convenient public transport, if not to actual destinations. In view of the positions occupied by the Royal Parks, and the fact that parking is permitted on the outer carriageways of Hyde Park and St. James's Park, we have considered whether full use has yet been made of their potentialities. We deplore that it should be necessary to consider any plan which might detract from the amenities which the Royal Parks are intended to afford, and we consider that all parking on the carriageways of these Parks should be considered as no more than an interim, even emergency, measure, until proper accommodation can be provided. Nevertheless, under present circumstances, we believe that a limited amount of parking accommodation could be provided on roads in Regent's Park at places near underground stations, but we cannot suggest any similar space for additional parking on the carriageways in the other Royal Parks. We do not recommend the provision of hard standing, even as a temporary measure, in any of the Parks, since we consider this would be an excessive invasion of London's open spaces, and would detract more from the amenities of the Parks than does the present parking on the carriageways.

42. A much better and more durable solution would appear to us to lie in the provision of underground car parks beneath the Royal Parks, particularly Hyde Park and Green Park which, if well designed,

need have no more than a negligible effect on amenities. We urge that the Government should not overlook the opportunity presented by the New Park Lane Scheme, the intention to proceed with which has now been announced, to provide at the same time an underground car park on the extreme north-east fringe of Hyde Park beneath the Parade Ground. We are informed that there are no practical or engineering difficulties in the way of this, and we observe that very few trees would be affected. Such a site would be ideally placed in relation to the region we have recommended for the first parking meter schemes, recommendations which we are pleased to note have been followed by the Westminster City and St. Marylebone Borough Councils. We hope also that it might be found possible eventually to provide underground car parks elsewhere in Hyde Park and in the other Royal Parks, a step which would permit the elimination of parking on the surface of the Parks altogether.

43. We note that Section 25 of the Road Traffic Act, 1956, enables the Minister of Works to charge for parking in the Royal Parks. We feel certain that there will be an additional demand for long-term parking accommodation in the Royal Parks as soon as nearby parking meter schemes are in operation and that as underground garages are unlikely to have been provided by that time it will become essential for the Minister of Works to exercise this power. We, therefore, recommend that he should make preparations accordingly now, even though we recognise that the need for this step ought to be regarded purely as a temporary expedient until the more durable solution to the parking problem, which we have proposed, is provided.

44. It was suggested to us that a number of disused railway sidings might usefully be converted to car parks and the Chairman therefore asked the British Transport Commission to make a quick survey of their properties in and on the fringe of the Inner Area to see whether any contribution could be made by allocating space for cars displaced from the streets when parking meters were introduced. The Commission informed us that, outside the central area, British Railways and the London Transport Executive were making special efforts to develop to a greater extent car parking facilities at their stations in the hope that motorists will be encouraged to leave their cars at the stations and continue their journeys into London by public transport. Within the central area, the Commission are prepared to consider the leasing of land on commercial terms to outside developers for the construction of car parking facilities. We understand that discussions are at present taking place between the Ministry of Transport and Civil Aviation, the London County Council and the various local authorities concerned on the possibility of utilising certain railway-owned sites which the Commission have intimated might be made available for use as car parks. We welcome this initiative on the part of the Commission and hope that arrangements can be made to bring as many sites as possible into use.

Signed on behalf of the Committee,

J. A. L. BARBER,  
Secretary.

A. SAMUELS,  
Chairman.

## Reservation by Mr. F. J. Forty

In general I have found myself in accord with my colleagues in our production of a plan for dealing with the parking problem in Inner London in accordance with the terms of reference from the Minister of Transport and Civil Aviation.

There is one matter, however, involving the use of the Royal Parks for car parking, in which I regret to find myself in disagreement, namely the continued use, as an interim measure, of the carriageways of the Parks. In these circumstances I feel the Minister would wish to have and would be helped by having the fullest expression of my opinion.

The Royal Parks are superb areas of grassland, trees, flowerbeds and garden layout. Made accessible through centuries by the graciousness of the Sovereign, they form almost rural retreats from the noise and bustle associated with the densely built up and highly trafficked area surrounding them. They are managed and maintained with a wholly admirable efficiency by the Ministry of Works. Everything possible should be done to preserve their amenities.

In my view the greatest possible interference with the pleasantness and beauty of the Parks comes from allowing motor cars to be lodged solidly the whole length of certain carriageways effectually preventing any hope of unimpeded enjoyment of the Parks' views and special provisions. Such continuous and continued obstruction is, I submit, a much greater detraction from amenities than controlled contained spaces of quite limited capacity would be, these being carefully selected so that the cars should be not visible and that the boundaries of such spaces should be made as agreeable as possible by careful planting.

The ideal condition in the Parks would, I submit, be no parking whatever above ground, but this of course is not likely to be realised. Any motor parking or indeed waiting for more than a moment or so, within the Parks' boundary should be so arranged as to cause the least possible interference with the enjoyment of the Parks by the greatest number of general public. Here above all places surely the last criterion to be adopted should be a utilitarian one.

In summary, I respectfully submit, the least interference with the magnificent views of Park land and the enjoyment of the Parks' arboreal and floral amenities will be caused by making spaces near the periphery in which a limited number of cars might be parked off the carriageways for limited periods. The spaces would be preferably below ground level, but otherwise on the surface suitably concealed from general view by the planting of shrubs and trees.





## Station Car Parks

Police Division	District Covered	Station Car Parks						Adjacent Street Parking		
		No.	Use three patrol raffling					No notifiable change	Small increase	Large increase
			Increased by 33 1/3 % and over	Increased by under 33 1/3 %	No increase	Decrease	Not used			
T	Balling-Woot Drayton and Staines	16	4	3	6	2	1	15	—	1
V	Barnes-Esher and Cobham	19	—	13	5	—	1	14	3	2
S	Finchley-Potters Bar	8	3	2	3	—	—	4	4	—
X	Harlesden-Uxbridge and Northwood	12	5	2	5	—	—	12	—	—
Y	Tottenham-Enfield	8	—	1	6	1	—	8	—	—
J	Walthamstow-Chigwell	17	2	—	14	1	—	15	2	—
K	East Ham-Dagenham	1	—	—	1	—	—	1	—	—
P	Dulwich-Farnborough	30	7	6	13	1	3	26	4	—
R	New Cross-Bexley	15	—	2	11	—	2	15	—	—
W	Tooting-Kingwood	14	6	—	7	1	—	14	—	—
Z	Streatham-Corndon	16	8	2	4	—	2	16	—	—
	Totals	156	35	31	75	6	9	140	13	3

<i>Division</i>	<i>Total Capacity of Station Car Parks</i>	<i>Average Use</i>	<i>Remaining available</i>
T	758	420	338
V	1,027	802	225
S	497	316	181
X	455	288	167
Y	424	266	158
J	500	355	145
K	10	2	8
P	719	409	310
R	426	165	261
W	552	245	307
Z	509	264	245
	5,877	3,532	2,345

List of Parking Place Proposals in the Inner Fringe Areas (N, NW, W)

	Location	Authority	Proposal	No. of Vehicles	Remarks
1	HYDE PARK CRESCENT	..	Double angle parking in centre	48	
2	CAMBRIDGE SQUARE	..	Parking parallel to centre island kerb on north side.	17	Official park already exists on south side for 14 cars.
3	OXFORD SQUARE	..	Parking parallel to centre island kerb on south side.	17	Official park already exists on north side for 14 cars.
4	QUEENSBOROUGH TERRACE	..	Parking parallel to kerb on east side.	29	
5	GLOUCESTER SQUARE	..	Parking parallel to island kerb on south side and in layby on north side.	33	Possible centre parking in Sussex Place and Radnor Place adjoining if required.
6	HYDE PARK GARDENS	..	Angle parking in lieu of parking parallel to mews—to be clearly marked with white lines.	Additional 30	The existing car park holds approximately 33 cars.
7	SUSSEX SQUARE	..	Parking parallel to kerb round centre island.	30	
8	LANCASTER GATE	..	Double angle parking and parking parallel to kerb.	34	Would be mostly used by large American cars but two spaces to be reserved for taxis.
9	INVERNESS TERRACE	..	Angle parking in centre in lieu of parking parallel to kerbs in centre and unofficially at sides.	Additional 20	Existing car park in centre of road parallel to kerbs for about 19 cars.
10	BOSTON PLACE (northern end)	..	Parking parallel to kerbs on west side.	13	Existing parking places at southern end of street.
11	HYDE PARK SQUARE	..	Parking parallel to kerbs in layby on north side.	10	Additional capacity for 32 vehicles on south and west sides if one-way traffic system is permanently adopted.
12	ROSMORE ROAD	..	Parking parallel to kerb on south side.	55	Additional capacity for 500 vehicles in depot yard on north side might become available subject to private negotiations.
13	MITCHEAM STREET	..	Parking parallel to kerbs on south side.	15	Additional capacity for 30 or 40 cars might be regularly available in L.C.C. parks by negotiation.
14	DORSET SQUARE	..	Parking parallel to kerb on south and west sides of centre island.	20	

	Location	Authority	Proposal	No. of Vehicles	Remarks
15	QUEENS GATE .. .. .	Kensington and Westminster	Angle parking in centre of road	Additional 250	A further 293 vehicles could be accommodated if double angle parking were substituted for single, giving a total of 543 vehicles in addition to the 43 that can be accommodated in the existing car park in the centre of the road. A certain amount of work might, however, be needed to make the site suitable for the extra 293 vehicles.
16	QUEENS GATE GARDENS .. .. .	Kensington	Parking parallel to kerb on north, south and east sides of central gardens.	37	
17	QUEENS GATE PLACE .. .. .	Kensington	Angle parking in centre of road	31	A certain amount of work might be needed to make the site suitable.
18	QUEENS GATE TERRACE .. .. .	Kensington	Parking parallel to kerbs down centre of road.	30	A further 45 vehicles could be accommodated if angle parking were substituted for parking parallel to the kerb, giving a total of 75 vehicles. A certain amount of work might, however, be needed to make the site suitable for the extra 45 vehicles.
19	PRINCE CONSORT ROAD .. .. .	Westminster	Parking parallel to kerb on north side.	40	A further 125 vehicles could be accommodated if angle parking on the south side of the road were also authorized, giving a total of 165 vehicles. A certain amount of work might, however, be needed to make the site suitable for the extra 125 vehicles.
20	IMPERIAL INSTITUTE ROAD .. .. .	Westminster and Kensington	Parking parallel to kerbs on north and south sides.	84	A further 106 cars could be accommodated if angle parking were substituted for parking parallel to the kerb, giving a total of 190 vehicles. A certain amount of work might, however, be needed to make the site suitable for the extra 106 vehicles.
21	PRINCES GARDENS .. .. .	Westminster	Parking parallel to kerb on north, south and east sides of central gardens.	40	
22	EXHIBITION ROAD .. .. .	Kensington and Westminster	Parking parallel to kerb in centre of the road.	78	A further 158 vehicles could be accommodated if parking were authorized parallel to the kerb on both sides of the road as well as in the centre, giving a total of 236 vehicles. A certain amount of work might, however, be needed to make the site suitable for the extra 158 vehicles.
SUGGESTED PARKING PLACE PROPOSALS FOR REGENT'S PARK					
23	REGENT'S PARK .. .. . (Outer Circle Road on south side)	St. Marylebone and St. Pancras	Parking parallel to kerb on north and south sides.	132	

List of Parking Place Proposals in the Area Immediately South of the Thames

	Location	Authority	Proposal	No. of Vehicles	Remarks
1	UPFORD STREET .. .. .	Lambeth	Parking parallel to kerb on north-west side.	12	
2	PEARMAN STREET .. .. .	Lambeth	Parking parallel to kerb on west side.	30	
3	FRAZER STREET .. .. . (west of Baylis Road)	Lambeth	Parking parallel to kerb on north side.	12	
4	LOLLARDS STREET .. .. . (south-east end)	Lambeth	Parking parallel to kerb on north-east side.	25	
5	SANSCROFT STREET .. .. . (eastern end)	Lambeth	Parking parallel to kerb on north side.	25	
6	CARDIGAN STREET .. .. .	Lambeth	Parking parallel to kerb on east side.	15	
7	NEWBURN STREET .. .. . (south-west end)	Lambeth	Parking parallel to kerb on north-west side.	20	
8	JONATHAN STREET .. .. . (east side of Tyers Street)	Lambeth	Parking parallel to kerb on north side.	15	
9	TYERS STREET .. .. . (north end)	Lambeth	Parking parallel to kerb on west side.	25	

*Note.*—There are a number of off street parks, e.g. Coin Street, Baylis Street and Zoar Street existing which are not fully used.

